[2nd November 1931

Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai:—" May I ask the hon. Member, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the Adi-Dravidas feel that there will be a certain amount of miscarriage of justice on account of the long delay in the matter? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" The Government have absolutley no such apprehension."

Civil Justice

Construction of an overbridge to connect the Small Causes Court buildings with the High Court buildings.

* 457 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the original estimates for the new Small Causes Court buildings provided for any overbridge connecting the new buildings with the present High Court buildings;

(*b*) if not, why this was omitted from the estimates and who is responsible for the same;

(*c*) whether any representations have been made to the hon. the Law Member, officially as to the necessity of an overbridge connecting the said two buildings; and

(*d*) whether the Government have examined the question of the approximate cost of an overbridge connecting the present High Court buildings and the new Small Causes Court buildings?

A.—(*a*) No.
(*b*) It was not thought necessary to provide an overbridge.
(*c*) & (*d*) No.

Comparative statement of suits and appeals instituted in the High Court and the Subordinate Civil Courts.

* 458 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the Government will be pleased to call for a comparative statement of suits and appeals instituted in the High Court and in the Subordinate Civil Courts in the Presidency for two months after the summer recess during the years 1929, 1930 and 1931?

A.—A statement [a] is laid on the table.

Receipts and expenditure of the District Munsif's Court at Palamcottah.

* 459 *Q.*—Mr. M. Devadasan: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what is the total receipt of income in the shape of Court-fees in each of the years 1928, 1929 and 1930 in the District Munsif's Court, Palamcottah;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 458 infra.

2nd November 1931]

(*b*) what is the total expenditure of the court per year;

(*c*) what is the total income and expenditure of the court of the District Munsif, Ambasamudram, in 1930; and

(*d*) whether there has been any protest made against the abolition of the Palamcottah District Munsif's Court, both by the bar and the litigant public?

A.—(*a*)—

		RS.	A.	P.
1928	... ...	28,717	1	0
1929	... ...	26,105	4	0
1930	... ...	31,254	8	0

(*b*)—

1928	... ...	8,473	3	7
1929	... ...	9,355	4	2
1930	... ...	9,526	8	7

(*c*)—

Income			*Expenditure.*		
RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
45,080	11	0	22,649	15	0

(*d*) Yes.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" May I know, Sir, in view of the fact that the income from the District Munsif's Court, Palamcottah, in 1930, was Rs. 31,254 and the expenditure during the period was only Rs. 9,256, whether the Government do not think that the Court should be allowed to continue? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No, Sir."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" May I ask whether the Government are aware that there was an increase of Rs. 5,000 in the income from court-fees in the year 1930? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Is it in addition to what is stated here? "

Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" Yes."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Government are not aware of it."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" Sir, my question is this: in 1929 the income of the Court was Rs. 26,105–4–0 and it rose in 1930 to Rs. 31,254–8–0. So there is an increase of Rs. 5,000 in the shape of court-fees."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It is patent from the figures."

Expenditure and income of the Sub-Court at Chittoor.

* 460 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have scrutinized the statistics of pending work in the Sub-Court at Chittoor, and examined whether its existence is necessary; and